



**STATE OF WISCONSIN**  
**Division of Hearings and Appeals**

---

In the Matter of

Milwaukee Enrollment Services, Petitioner

vs.

DECISION

Case #: FOF - 159421

██████████, Respondent

---

Pursuant to petition filed July 29, 2014, under Wis. Admin. Code §HA 3.03, and 7 C.F.R. § 273.16, to review a decision by the Milwaukee Enrollment Services to disqualify ██████████ from receiving FoodShare benefits (FS) for one year, a hearing was held on Tuesday, September 16, 2014 at 12:45 PM, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The issue for determination is whether the respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

**PARTIES IN INTEREST:**

Petitioner:

Milwaukee Enrollment Services  
1220 W Vliet St  
Milwaukee, WI 53205  
By: Pamela Hazley, HSPC, Sr.

Respondent:

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████

█

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:**

Kelly Cochrane  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The respondent (CARES # [REDACTED]) is a resident of Milwaukee County who received FS benefits in Milwaukee County from at least April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2014.
2. On February 5, 2012 respondent signed a lease at her address of record with [REDACTED], her husband and father of her child. See Exhibit 4.
3. On May 23, 2012 respondent completed a FS renewal in which she does not list her husband in the home. See Exhibit 5.
4. On November 26, 2012 respondent completed a six month review form (SMRF) in which she does not list her husband in the home. See Exhibit 6.
5. On June 3, 2013 respondent completed another FS renewal in which she does not list her husband in the home. See Exhibit 7.
6. On December 17, 2013 respondent completed another FS renewal in which she does not list her husband in the home. See Exhibit 8.
7. On February 11, 2014 the FS agency received an email from the child support agency stating that respondent was married to [REDACTED], they had a child in common, that [REDACTED] bankruptcy filings listed his address as respondent's, [REDACTED] income, and that the couple had purchased a vehicle together in 2013. See Exhibit 9.
8. The agency consistently mailed respondent FS program information about FS rules, reporting requirements and sanctions for FS violations, and the petitioner acknowledged those rules with her renewals. See Exhibits 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12.
9. In June 2014 the agency's Program Integrity Unit investigated this matter and discovered additional evidence (See Exhibit 10) that led the agency to conclude that respondent's husband was living in her home:
  - a. Wisconsin Court System Circuit Court Access records showing the respondent's husband's address of record as respondent's address;
  - b. Credit reports showing the respondent's husband's address of record as respondent's address;
  - c. Respondent's husband's employment records showing the respondent's husband's address of record as respondent's address;
  - d. Wisconsin Child Support records (KIDS) showing the respondent's husband's residential address of record as respondent's address.
10. On May 21, 2014 the agency issued a FoodShare Overpayment Notices to respondent stating that she has been overpaid FS due to client error for failing to report accurate household members.
11. On August 5, 2014, the petitioner prepared an Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice alleging that respondent concealed facts for the purposed of receiving FS.
12. The respondent failed to appear for the scheduled September 16, 2014 Intentional Program Violation (IPV) hearing and did not provide any good cause for said failure to appear.

## DISCUSSION

An intentional program violation of the FoodShare program occurs when a recipient intentionally does the following:

1. makes a false or misleading statement, or misrepresents, conceals or withholds facts;  
or
2. commits any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any Wisconsin statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of FoodShare benefits or QUEST cards.

*FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1; *see also* 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(c) and Wis. Stat. §§ 946.92(2).

An intentional program violation can be proven by a court order, a diversion agreement entered into with the local district attorney, a waiver of a right to a hearing, or an administrative disqualification hearing, *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1. The petitioner can disqualify only the individual found to have committed the intentional violation; it cannot disqualify the entire household. Those disqualified on grounds involving the improper transfer of FS benefits are ineligible to participate in the FoodShare program for one year for the first violation, two years for the second violation, and permanently for the third violation. Although other family members cannot be disqualified, their monthly allotments will be reduced unless they agree to make restitution within 30 days of the date that the FS program mails a written demand letter. 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(b).

7 C.F.R. §273.16(e)(4) provides that the hearing shall proceed if the respondent cannot be located or fails to appear without good cause. The respondent did not appear or claim a good cause reason for not attending the hearing. Therefore, I must determine whether the respondent committed an IPV based solely on the evidence that the petitioner presented at hearing.

In order for the petitioner to establish that an FS recipient has committed an IPV, it has the burden to prove two separate elements by clear and convincing evidence. The recipient must have: 1) committed; and 2) intended to commit a program violation per 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(6). In *Kuehn v. Kuehn*, 11 Wis.2d 15 (1959), the court held that:

Defined in terms of quantity of proof, reasonable certitude or reasonable certainty in ordinary civil cases may be attained by or be based on a mere or fair preponderance of the evidence. Such certainty need not necessarily exclude the probability that the contrary conclusion may be true. In fraud cases it has been stated the preponderance of the evidence should be clear and satisfactory to indicate or sustain a greater degree of certitude. Such degree of certitude has also been defined as being produced by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence. Such evidence, however, need not eliminate a reasonable doubt that the alternative or opposite conclusion may be true. ...

*Kuehn*, 11 Wis.2d at 26.

*Wisconsin Jury Instruction – Civil 205* is also instructive. It provides:

Clear, satisfactory and convincing evidence is evidence which when weighed against that opposed to it clearly has more convincing power. It is evidence which satisfies and convinces you that “yes” should be the answer because of its greater weight and clear convincing power. “Reasonable certainty” means that you are persuaded based upon a rational consideration of the evidence. Absolute certainty is not required, but a guess is not enough to meet the burden of proof. This burden of proof is known as the “middle burden.” The evidence required to meet this burden of proof must be more convincing than merely the greater weight of the credible evidence but may be less than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Further, the *McCormick* treatise states that “it has been persuasively suggested that [the clear and convincing evidence standard of proof] could be more simply and intelligibly translated to the jury if they were instructed that they must be persuaded that the truth of the contention is highly probable.” 2 *McCormick on Evidence* § 340 (John W. Strong gen. ed., 4<sup>th</sup> ed. 1992).

Thus, in order to find that an IPV was committed, the trier of fact must derive from the evidence, a firm conviction as to the existence of each of the two elements even though there may exist a reasonable doubt that the opposite is true.

In order to prove the second element, i.e., intention, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient intended to commit the IPV. The question of intent is generally one to be determined by the trier of fact. *State v. Lossman*, 118 Wis.2d 526 (1984). There is a general rule that a person is presumed to know and intend the probable and natural consequences of his or her own voluntary words or acts. See, *John F. Jelke Co. v. Beck*, 208 Wis. 650 (1932); 31A C.J.S. Evidence §131. Intention is a subjective state of mind to be determined upon all the facts. *Lecus v. American Mut. Ins. Co. of Boston*, 81 Wis.2d 183 (1977). Thus, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient knew that the act or omission was a violation of the FS Program but committed the violation anyway.

I find that the respondent misrepresented that her husband was not living with her in order to receive more FS in Wisconsin. The documentation showing that they share the same address is uncontradicted by any direct, credible explanation. The overpayment worksheets show that his earned income would have put them over the FS income limit and they would not have been eligible for FS had that income been reported in the household. The continuous affirmative reporting that he was not in the home at each FS renewal led them to receive FS to which they were not entitled. The respondent has not responded to the allegations either by way of this hearing or in response to the overpayments. I will also, therefore, take her lack of response and appearance as an admission of the allegations and find that the agency has met its burden of proof with the evidence it has presented that the intentional program violation occurred.

Based upon the record before me, I find that the petitioner has established by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally violated FS program rules, and that this violation was the first such violation committed by the respondent. Therefore, the petitioner correctly seeks to disqualify the respondent from the FS program for one year.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The respondent violated, and intended to violate, the FS program rule specifying that that an intentional program violation of the FoodShare program occurs when a recipient intentionally makes a false or misleading statement, or misrepresents, conceals or withholds facts
2. The violation specified in Conclusion of Law No. 1 is the first such violation committed by the respondent.

**NOW, THEREFORE, it is**

**ORDERED**

That the petitioner’s determination is sustained, and that the petitioner may make a finding that the respondent committed a first IPV of the FoodShare program and disqualify the respondent from the program for one year, effective the first month following the date of receipt of this decision.

## REQUEST FOR A REHEARING ON GROUNDS OF GOOD CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR

In instances where the good cause for failure to appear is based upon a showing of non-receipt of the hearing notice, the respondent has 30 days after the date of the written notice of the hearing decision to claim good cause for failure to appear. See 7 C.F.R. sec. 273.16(e)(4). Such a claim should be made in writing to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875.

## APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be filed with the Court **and** served either personally or by certified mail on the Secretary of the Department of Health Services, 1 West Wilson Street, Room 651, Madison, WI 53703, **and** on those identified in this decision as “PARTIES IN INTEREST” **no more than 30 days after the date of this decision** or 30 days after a denial of a timely rehearing request (if you request one).

The process for Circuit Court Appeals may be found at Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53. A copy of the statutes may be found online or at your local library or courthouse.

Given under my hand at the City of Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin, this 30th day of September, 2014

---

\sKelly Cochrane  
Administrative Law Judge  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

c: Miles - email  
Public Assistance Collection Unit - email  
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability - email  
Pamela Hazley - email



## **State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**

Brian Hayes, Administrator  
Suite 201  
5005 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096  
FAX: (608) 264-9885  
email: [DHAmail@wisconsin.gov](mailto:DHAmail@wisconsin.gov)  
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on September 30, 2014.

Milwaukee Enrollment Services  
Public Assistance Collection Unit  
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability  
[Pamela.Hazley@dhs.wisconsin.gov](mailto:Pamela.Hazley@dhs.wisconsin.gov)